DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 297 388 CS 506 285

AUTHOR Bode, Robert Allen
TITLE Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi's Rhetorical and Ethical Perspective: A Novel Approach.
PUB DATE Nov 88
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (74th, New Orleans, LA, November 3-6, 1988). For related document, see CS 506 286.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication Research; *Ethics; Foreign Countries; Interpersonal Relationship; Research Needs; *Rhetorical Criticism; *Speech Communication; *Violence
IDENTIFIERS *Gandhi (Mahatma); India; *Nonviolence; Passivity; Power; Rhetorical Strategies

ABSTRACT

In order to discover whether Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi's rhetorical perspective has provided a unique ethical perspective of communication, a review of the literature on existing ethical perspectives of communication would be in order. Ronald C. Arnett and Richard L. Johannesen, two contemporary researchers, have provided thorough reviews of ethical perspectives. Their ideas provide a clear backdrop against which Gandhi's perspective may be analyzed. At the center of Gandhi's rhetorical perspective is both the implicit and explicit rejection of violence. He assumed communication can be nonviolent and violent, and that distinctions between means and ends of communication can be collapsed. In addition, Gandhi assumed communicators (1) are active rather than passive; (2) share power; and (3) should focus on preserving relationships. Gandhi's unique view of rhetoric, of communication, and of communicators can be seen as a contribution to society's understanding of the ethnicality of rhetoric. (Twenty-nine notes are included, and 10 references are appended.) (MS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED297388

MOHANDAS KARAMCHAND GANDHI'S RHETORICAL AND ETHICAL PERSPECTIVE: A NOVEL APPROACH

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Robert Allen Bode

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

by

ROBERT ALLEN BODE

School of Communication
Box 8118, University Station
University of North Dakota
Grand Forks, North Dakota 58202
Message (701) 777-2192
Office (701) 777-3447

CS506285

ABSTRACT

Mahatma Gandhi's rhetorical and ethical perspective is novel. He assumed communication can be nonviolent and violent, and that distinctions between means and ends of communication can be collapsed. In addition, Gandhi assumed communicators are active rather than passive, assumed communicators share power, and assumed communicators should focus on preserving relationships. This paper also presents several test questions that communicators can ask in order to judge the ethicality of rhetorical choices. Finally, avenues for future research are recommended.

In order to discover whether Gandhi's rhetorical perspective has provided a unique ethical perspective of communication, several existing ethical perspectives of communication will be reviewed to provide a backdrop against which Gandhi's ethical system may be viewed. The guiding assumption for this project is that Gandhi's rhetorical perspective may offer a unique ethical perspective of communication that has not been addressed adequately by existing ethical perspectives of communication. The goal is to discover an ethical perspective of communication that best applies to Gandhi's rhetoric.

Many scholars of rhetoric and communication have contributed to our understanding of existing ethical perspectives of communication, but two recent contributors have provided perhaps the most complete reviews and explanations, Arnett and Johannesen.[1] This review of existing ethical perspectives relies heavily on their scholarly contributions. Arnett discusses five existing categories of ethical perspectives, and while Johannesen appears generally to agree on the number of existing categories of ethical perspectives, each author has labeled and described them differently.

Arnett states that categories of ethical perspectives of communication include democratic ethics; universal/humanitarian ethics; codes, procedures, and

standards ethics; contextual ethics; and narrative ethics.[2] Johannesen sees the categories of ethical perspectives of communication as political perspectives; human nature perspectives; dialogical perspectives; situational perspectives; and religious, utilitarian, and legal perspectives.[3]

As Arnett reviewed the literature in order to determine the status of ethics scholarship in speech communication journals from 1915 to 1985, he discovered concepts, metaphors, phrases, descriptions, and vocabulary that were used to describe and explain each ethical perspective. A review of these will provide a brief overview of each ethical perspective. With regard to the democratic ethics perspective, Arnett points out:

> The following were frequently used concepts and metaphors for this approach: democracy, self-determination, linking democracy to conscious rational choice, debate and open discussion, freedom of dissent, cooperative controversy, democracy for methodology for discussion, and recognition of the value of diversity of opinion.[4]

The universal/humanitarian ethical perspective can be summarized in this way:

> Phrases and metaphors represented by this ethical position include the following: humanness, culture, wisdom, levels of morality, dignity, social value, human values, reasonable[ness] . . . human knowledge principles, critique of ethical relativism, character, commitment, responsibility, and human rights.[5]

Arnett groups together scholars who have made efforts to find objective measures for determining what is and is not ethical communicative behavior and claims:

> Rating scales, standards, codes of ethics, procedures for argument, testing and/or measurement of values, ethical proof, and guidelines are words and phrases used to describe this approach [codes, standards, and procedures] to communication ethics.[6]

With regard to contextual ethics, Arnett points out that:

> Choice, variability, flexibility, critique of absolutes and universals, rule violation, audience and context adaptations, belief and a value manifested in a specific situation, reflect vocabulary associated with this approach.[7]

Arnett suggests also that contextual ethics may be viewed as a counterpart to the codes, standards, and procedures ethical perspective.[8]

> Arnett's final category is narrative ethics: Words and phrases associated with narrative ethics are as follows: narrative, Homer, story, community, drama, and homo narrans. This story-telling orientation is closely tied to an understanding of praxis that is grounded in "practice," rather than "technique." "Technique" is a "cookbook" or formula dictating a precise method to follow.[9]

Johannesen's contributions to our understanding of ethical considerations of communication are perhaps unparalleled in rhetoric and communication. Johannesen, in a sense, has provided the seminal work against which ethics scholarship in communication is measured. The following brief review of his categorization of ethical perspectives

of communication will provide a clearer backdrop against which Gandhi's ethical perspective of communication may be viewed.

Political perspectives constitute Johannesen's first category of ethical perspectives of communication.[10] Johannesen relies on the work of Wallace[11] as he suggests that in democracies we

> should develop the habit of search stemming from recognition that during the moments we are communicating we are the primary, if not the sole, source of arguments and information on the subject at hand. . . . should cultivate the habit of justice by selecting and presenting fact and opinion fairly. . . . should habitually prefer public to private motivations. . . . [and should] cultivate the habit of respect for dissent by allowing and encouraging diversity of argument and opinion.[12]

Johannesen relies on several ethicists as he suggests that significant choices[13] must be present for communication techniques to be considered ethical, there are ground rules to which persons should adhere during political controversy,[14] and we should consider democratic debate[15] as a means of achieving ends.[16]

The assumption that undergirds the next category for Johannesen, the human nature perspectives, "is that uniquely human attributes should be enhanced, thereby promoting fulfillment of maximum individual potential . . . a technique which dehumanizes, makes a person less than human, is unethical."[17] The ability to reason and use symbols can

be considered a uniquely human attribute. Johnstone contributes to Johannesen's human nature perspectives by suggesting that persons should strive to achieve a humane ethic for rhetoric and avoid rhetoric that dehumanizes.[18]

Dialogical perspectives of communication are another category for Johannesen, and such perspectives have often been contrasted with monologue:

> Central characteristics of dialogical communication are treated by various scholars under a variety of labels: authentic communication, facilitative communication, therapeutic communication, nondirective therapy, presence, participation, existential communication, encounter, self-disclosing communication, actualizing communication, supportive communication, helping relationship, caring relationship, and loving relationship. So, too, various labels are used to designate the features of monological communication: defensive communication, manipulative communication, inauthentic communication, directive communication, etc.[19]

As Johannesen characterized dialogue, he suggests that dialogue is more "a spirit, orientation, or bearing in communication rather than a specific method, technique, or format."[20] Authenticity (direct and honest communication), inclusion (experiencing the other side), confirmation (valuing another person's right to individuality), presentness (full concentration without distraction), spirit of mutual equality (refusing to exploit or impose an opinion or will on another), and a supportive psychological climate (listening without competing or warping meanings) are

earmarks of dialogical perspectives, according to Johannesen.[21]

"Situational perspectives," according to Johannesen, "focus regularly and primarily on the elements of the specific communication situation at hand. . . . [A]n extreme situational perspective routinely makes judgments only in light of each different context."[22] For discussion of situational ethical perspectives, Johannesen relies on Rogge, who has argued that ethical criteria should vary from situation to situation,[23] and Alinsky, who suggests that we must "accept open-ended systems of ethics and values" in order to meet changing conditions and in order to "survive in a fluid society."[24]

Religious, utilitarian, and legal perspectives constitute another of Johannesen's categories of ethical perspectives of communication. While each of these ethical perspectives may be considered a separate perspective, Johannesen has presented them in such a manner so as to suggest they may be considered together.[25] Religious ethical perspectives have been derived from a variety of world religions that have emphasized "moral and spiritual values, guidelines, and rules that can be employed as standards for evaluating the ethics of communication."[26] Utilitarian perspectives, which have been synthesized by Brockriede, are based on the notion that proposals that

promote the greatest happiness for the greatest number are the most ethical and that these proposals should be supported by good reasons and evidence. Persons who adhere to legal perspectives ordinarily "take the general position that illegal human behavior also is unethical."[27]

The variety of ethical perspectives of communication that have been made available to rhetorical theorists and critics by Johannesen and Arnett, then, provide several lenses through which the ethicality of rhetorical and communicative behaviors may be evaluated.

In the final portion of this project, I will suggest that Gandhi's ethical perspective of communication does not fit snugly into any of these existing categories of ethical perspectives and offer an ethical perspective that best applies to Gandhi's rhetorical perspective.

Existing Ethical Perspectives Applied to Gandhi's Rhetorical Perspective

Several scholars have suggested that some of Gandhi's methods of communication or his orientation toward communication might be appropriately categorized within existing ethical perspectives.[28] While particular aspects of Gandhi's rhetorical perspective arguably could fit within almost any of the existing ethical perspectives, I will suggest that this view of Gandhi's ethics is only partially correct. For example, we know that Gandhi was an outspoken

proponent for freedom of speech, press, and public discussion. Thus, Gandhi could be placed among those who practice democratic ethics as articulated by Arnett as well as with those who approach communication from political perspectives as stated by Johannesen.

Gandhi's approach to communicating relates also to the universal/humanitarian ethical perspective and to the human nature perspectives. The dignity and human rights of Indians and of all human beings were very much a concern for Gandhi. He struggled to gain for Indians the fundamental human right of freedom from oppressive British rule. As Gandhi helped people to realize greater potential through the constructive programme, he appears to have been practicing communication from a human nature perspective. Gandhi's insistence upon nonviolent speech and acts is analogous also to Johnstone's and Johannesen's view that suggests persons should avoid rhetoric that dehumanizes.

In keeping with the ethical perspective based on codes, procedures, and standards, Gandhi's fundamental precepts of Satyagraha come to mind. As Gandhi laid out steps for Satyagrahis to follow during a campaign, he recommended truth, nonviolence, and self-suffering as precepts that might be considered analogous to a code, a set of procedures, or a type of standard for Satyagrahis to follow.

The manner in which Gandhi communicated also could be referred to as similar to dialogical perspectives. Gandhi periodically acted as a facilitator between conflicting parties. He was willing to genuinely consider an opponent's views and to change his own mind if so persuaded. Gandhi had high regard for persons, even for those with whom he disagreed, and he valued the relationships between himself and such persons as well.

Gandhi's communication orientation can be directly related as well to contextual or situational ethical systems because for Gandhi, truths changed and were to be worked out among conflicting parties as situations warranted. He approached conflict situations with a desire to co-create realities, recognized the need for a flexible negotiating position, and adapted strategies and techniques as conditions surrounding campaigns changed.

Because Gandhi related stories to readers of Harijan (a newspaper for which Gandhi frequently wrote), about the importance of nonviolent speech and acts, he could be placed among those who engaged in a form of narrative ethics. Finally, because of his religious orientation, because he was frequently concerned with the greatest happiness for the greatest number and because he was a lawyer who argued for or against causes, Gandhi might appropriately be placed

among those whose communication ethics are governed by religious, utilitarian, or legal perspectives.

Despite consonance between aspects of Gandhi's rhetorical perspective and existing ethical perspectives for communicating, Gandhi has a unique ethical perspective that derives from his rhetorical perspective. In the next section, this ethical perspective will be suggested.

Gandhi's Ethical Perspective for Communicating Derived from His Rhetorical Perspective

Gandhi's rhetorical perspective is unique because a core unit of his rhetorical perspective consists of nonviolent speech and acts. At the center of Gandhi's rhetorical perspective is both the implicit and explicit rejection of violence. While other rhetorical perspectives may sanction nonviolence implicitly, other rhetorical perspectives do not make nonviolence an explicit starting point. An analysis of Gandhi's rhetorical perspective reveals a unique ethical perspective.

Two sets of assumptions that undergird Gandhi's rhetorical perspective can be derived and used as starting points for the formulation of Gandhi's ethical system. These assumptions delineate what makes Gandhi's rhetorical perspective different from other rhetorical perspectives and should suggest areas where new ethical notions need to be devised. The first assumptions are those about

communication; the second assumptions are those that concern the roles of communicators.

Assumptions About Communication

There are two assumptions about communication that undergird Gandhi's rhetorical perspective: (1) Communication can be nonviolent and violent; and (2) Distinctions between means and ends are capable of being collapsed. Each of these assumptions will be discussed in turn.

Gandhi's rhetorical perspective assumes that communication can be nonviolent and violent. On many occasions, Gandhi specifically stated what he considered to be examples of violent speech and acts. Gandhi stated to individuals such as Jinnah and Linlithgow (who were rivals of his), to groups such as the Indian Congress, and to national and international audiences through Harijan those kinds of violent rhetorical practices that he believed should be avoided.

Rhetorical perspectives other than Gandhi's largely ignore the importance of nonviolence. Rhetorical perspectives other than Gandhi's neither define nor distinguish between nonviolent and violent speech. In addition, rhetorical theorists have neither urged us to

practice nonviolent speech nor have they urged us to refrain from the use of violent speech.

Gandhi's rhetorical perspective assumes the distinction between means and ends is capable of being collapsed. This assumption is directly related to the first assumption. Stated briefly, nonviolence is both the means of communication and the end of communication. Stated another way, violence is not an acceptable means or end of communication.

Other rhetorical perspectives have not properly addressed means and ends regarding nonviolent and violent speech. Some Sophists overlooked the means-and-ends question and practiced rhetorical strategies designed primarily to bring about the accomplishment of a particular end, paying little attention to the means of persuasion. Rhetorical practices that were intended to bring about nonviolent ends could not, according to Gandhi's rhetorical perspective, be justified if a rhetor were to engage in violent means. Neither could a rhetor, from Gandhi's view, justifiably engage in violent means in order to bring about a nonviolent end. Gandhi's rhetorical perspective assumed there was no difference between means and ends, and his rhetorical perspective collapsed this distinction.

Assumptions About Communicators

The second set of assumptions that undergird Gandhi's rhetorical perspective concerns communicators. Three assumptions about communicators can be derived from his rhetorical perspective: (1) Communicators are active rather than passive; (2) Communicators share power; and (3) Communicators should focus on relationships.

Gandhi's rhetorical perspective assumes communicators--even audience members--are active rather than passive. Listeners are expected to respond, to participate, to contribute, to argue, and to debate propositions that are asserted to them. Listeners are not assumed by Gandhi to be passive receivers of information. They are expected to participate in the process of discovering workable truths. Rhetorical theorists have assumed single rhetors are capable of discovering truths, that single rhetors have a right to impart truths, and that single rhetors are capable of accurately imparting truths to passive listeners. Gandhi's rhetorical perspective rejects these notions by placing the creation of truths between speakers and listeners whose roles are exchanged in active, turn-taking dialogues.

Gandhi's rhetorical perspective assumes that communicators share power. A fundamental precept of Satyagraha (self-suffering) relates to this assumption. According to Gandhi's rhetorical perspective, interlocutors

engage one another with proposals and counter-proposals. This is not an uncommon form of interaction in negotiation situations, but what is uncommon is self-suffering. Self-suffering, from Gandhi's perspective, means that communicators should admit freely the other party is capable of making perfectly reasonable proposals. In a sense, the sharing of power is analogous to a sharing of ethos and credibility, a view that is uncommon to rhetorical perspectives in which the speaker (and not the listener) is expected to be more credible. Communicators, according to Gandhi's rhetorical perspective, at least temporarily abdicate power by self-suffering and by sharing power through the sharing of ethos and credibility.

Gandhi's rhetorical perspective assumes that maintaining relationships is paramount. Communicators should recognize the primacy of persons and relationships. Gandhi sought to maintain relationships even with opponents. He believed also that conflicts could draw persons nearer. Such a communication orientation places the survival of relationship above and beyond winning an argument or accomplishing a selfish end. Rhetorical perspectives that place winning at the expense of persons or relationships are in contrast to Gandhi's rhetorical perspective, which encouraged both maintenance of relationships and enrichment of personhood.

Gandhi's Ethical Perspective for Communicating

The two assumptions about communication and the three assumptions about communicators constitute the foundation of Gandhi's ethical perspective for communicating. To my satisfaction, no single, existing ethical perspective, nor any combination of existing ethical perspectives, appropriately applies to Gandhi's rhetorical perspective and these assumptions. Existing ethical perspectives do not appropriately apply to or focus on the assumption that communication can be nonviolent and violent, on the assumption that distinctions between means and ends can be collapsed, on the assumption that communicators are active rather than passive, on the assumption that communicators share power, or on the assumption that communicators should focus on relationships. From each of these assumptions may be derived a set of ethical questions that constitute a starting point for Gandhi's ethical perspective.

The following assumptions and ethical questions that may be derived are unique to Gandhi's rhetorical perspective. They do not exist in isolation from one another; rather, the assumptions and questions depend on and interact with one another. Each of the following assumptions and questions are not presented in any particular order; they should not be viewed as hierarchical.

Assumption One: Gandhi's Rhetorical Perspective Assumes Communication Can Be Nonviolent and Violent

Ethical questions derived from the assumption include:

(1) Have I used rhetorical strategies or tactics that I intend to be and believe to be nonviolent?

(2) Have I used rhetorical strategies or tactics that I believe my particular audience will interpret as nonviolent?

Assumption Two: Gandhi's Rhetorical Perspective Assumes Distinctions Between Means and Ends Are Capable of Being Collapsed

Ethical questions derived from this assumption might be:

(1) Are both my means and ends nonviolent?

(2) Have I implemented safeguards to be certain that my means do not generate violent ends?

Assumption Three: Gandhi's Rhetorical Perspective Assumes Communicators Are Active Rather Than Passive

Ethical questions derived from this assumption might be:

(1) Have I taken steps to ensure that receivers have an opportunity to respond?

(2) Have I actively encouraged the participation of my audience in a dialogue?

(3) In the event receivers do not respond to me, can I justifiably assert that a search for truth has been carried out?

(4) Am I truly willing to engage in self-suffering--to change my position and view of the truth--if such change seems warranted?

Assumption Four: Gandhi's Rhetorical Perspective Assumes Communicators Share Power

Ethical questions derived from this assumption might be:

(1) Have I taken steps to enhance the credibility of my interlocutors?

(2) Is my rhetoric based on the assumption that my interlocutors are credible, powerful, and significant?

Assumption Five: Gandhi's Rhetorical Perspective Assumes Communicators Should Focus on Relationships

Ethical questions derived from this assumption might be:

(1) Does my rhetoric draw persons nearer to one another?

(2) Are relational concerns more important to me than my winning the argument? Do I convey these priorities in my rhetoric?

The previous assumptions and ethical questions that may be derived from Gandhi's rhetorical perspective have provided a novel ethical perspective from which to view communication. Gandhi's assumptions that communication can be nonviolent and violent, that distinctions between means and ends are capable of being collapsed, that communicators are active rather than passive, that communicators share power, and that communicators should focus on relationships do not appropriately fit into existing ethical perspectives. Gandhi's unique view of rhetoric, of communication, and of communicators can be seen as a contribution to our understanding of the ethicality of rhetoric.

Recommendations for Future Research

One avenue of research that may be pursued by rhetorical theorists and critics is an investigation of samples of Gandhi's rhetoric from particular time periods. For example, Gandhi was directly involved in "three great national campaigns" from "1919-1922, 1927-1932, and [from] 1939-1943."[29] Analyses of samples of Gandhi's rhetoric from these periods may yield results that add to our understanding of Gandhi's rhetorical perspective.

Another promising line of research might be for rhetorical theorists and critics to analyze samples of Gandhi's rhetoric that were intended for family members.

Analyses of rhetoric that was intended for a particular family member, such as his wife, Kasturbai, may produce findings that suggest Gandhi's private rhetorical practices were quite similar to or different from his public rhetorical practices.

Another recommendation for future research in which rhetorical theorists and critics might engage is the analysis of Gandhi's rhetoric focusing on questions of gender. A general research question might be: Did Gandhi talk to women and men in the same manner? A particular research question might be designed to unearth similar or dissimilar metaphors Gandhi used in speech that was directed toward women and men. Such studies may yield interesting findings because Gandhi was said to be exploitive of women.

Additional research studies that focus on Gandhi's ethical perspective or underlying value structure may be useful. His ability or inability to bring about effective social change by adhering to a particular ethical perspective or value system may inform us about the efficacy of his methods. Additional work also might be done to evaluate and investigate further Gandhi's ethical system. Particular research questions that could be pursued along these lines include:

(1) If a rhetor refuses to communicate openly and flexibly, can he or she be indicted for violence?

(2) Under what circumstances will nonviolent means result in the accomplishment of violent ends?

(3) Can a rhetor achieve a nonviolent end through violent means?

(4) If a rhetor prevents receivers from an opportunity to participate, can he or she justifiably assert a concern with the maintenance of relationships and enriching personhood?

(5) Can a refusal to share power be construed as violence?

(6) Can winning an argument at the expense of relationships be construed as violence?

Final recommendations for future research include studies that focus on nonviolence, conflict resolution, and peace making. One important research question might be: Can nonviolent conflict resolution methods be taught? Another important research question could be: Are nonviolent conflict resolution methods, if taught, transferable from one setting to another? A third research question could be: Can nonviolent conflict resolution methods, if taught, bring about lasting peace between persons across communication contexts?

Studies such as the ones recommended, as well as others, would add substantially to ongoing conversations between rhetorical theorists, critics, communication

ethicists and others about Gandhi's contributions in various areas. A variety of scholars from many disciplines are encouraged to participate.

Notes

[1]Ronald C. Arnett, "The Status of Ethics Scholarship in Speech Communication Journals from 1915 to 1985," paper presented at the Speech Communication Association, Denver, Colorado: November, 1985, pp. 1-43; Richard L. Johannesen, Ethics in Human Communication, 2d ed., (Prospect Heights, Illinois: Waveland, 1983).

[2]Arnett, pp. 7-27.

[3]Johannesen, pp. 11-89.

[4]Arnett, p. 7.

[5]Ibid., p. 11.

[6]Ibid., p. 15.

[7]Ibid., p. 19.

[8]Ibid.

[9]Ibid., p. 21.

[10]Johannesen, pp. 11-28.

[11]Karl R. Wallace, "An Ethical Basis of Communication," Speech Teacher 4 (January 1955): 1-9.

[12]Johannesen, p. 12.

[13]Thomas R. Nilsen, Ethics of Speech Communication, 2d ed. (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1974), pp. 35-49.

[14]Sidney Hook, "The Ethics of Controversy," The New Leader (February 1, 1954): 12-14.

[15]Dennis G. Day, "The Ethics of Democratic Debate," Central States Speech Journal 17 (February 1966): 5-14.

[16]Johannesen, pp. 15-20.

[17]Ibid., p. 29.

[18]Christopher Lyle Johnstone, "Ethics, Wisdom, and the Mission of Contemporary Rhetoric: The Realization of Human Being," Central States Speech Journal 32 (Fall 1981): 177-88.

[19]Johannesen, p. 45.

[20]Ibid., p. 50.

[21]Ibid., pp. 50-1.

[22]Ibid., p. 67.

[23]Edward Rogge, "Evaluating the Ethics of a Speaker in a Democracy," Quarterly Journal of Speech 45 (December 1959): 419-25.

[24]Saul D. Alinsky, Reveille for Radicals (New York: Vintage 1969), p. 207.

[25]Johannesen has linked these perspectives together in a single chapter. To my knowledge, he has not referred to them as constituting a specific, single category of ethical perspectives. My decision to present them as a fifth category is one of convenience primarily to juxtapose Johannesen's work with that of Arnett.

[26]Johannesen, p. 77.

[27]Johannesen, pp. 83-5.

[28]Michael J. Beatty, Ralph R. Behnke, and Barbara Jane Banks, "Elements of Dialogic Communication in Gandhi's Second Round Table Conference Address," Southern Speech Communication Journal 44 (Summer, 1979): 386-98; V. V. Ramana Murti, "Buber's Dialogue and Gandhi's Satyagraha," Journal of the History of Ideas 29 (Oct.-Dec. 1968): 605-13.

29Francis G. Hutchins, India's Revolution: Gandhi and the Quit India Movement (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1973), p. 183.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arnett, Ronald C. "The Status of Ethics Scholarship in Speech Communication Journals from 1915 to 1985," prepared for Speech Communication Association. Denver, Colo.: November, 1985.

Beatty, Michael J., Behnke, Ralph R., and Banks, Barbara Jane. "Elements of Dialogic Communication in Gandhi's Second Round Table Conference Address." Southern Speech Communication Journal 44 (Summer, 1979): 386-98.

Day, Dennis. "The Ethics of Democratic Debate." Central States Speech Journal 17 (February 1966): 5-14.

Hook, Sidney. "The Ethics of Controversy." The New Leader (February 1, 1954): 12-14.

Hutchins, Francis G. India's Revolution: Gandhi and the Quit India Movement. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Johannesen, Richard L. Ethics in Human Communication. 2d ed. Prospect Heights, Ill: Waveland Press, 1983.

Johnstone, Christopher Lyle. "Ethics, Wisdom, and the Mission of Contemporary Rhetoric: The Realization of Human Being." Central States Speech Journal 32 (Fall 1981): 177-88.

Murti, V. V. Ramana. "Buber's Dialogue and Gandhi's Satyagraha." Journal of the History of Ideas 29 (Oct.-Dec. 1968): 605-13.

Nilsen, Rhomas R. Ethics of Speech Communication. 2d ed. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill. 1974.

Rogge, Edward. "Evaluating the Ethics of a Speaker in a Democracy." Quarterly Journal of Speech 45 (December 1959): 419-25.